

THE  
PLAIN-DEALING  
OF THE  
**Quakers :**

OR AN  
**A N S W E R**

To the late BOOK

INTITULED,

*The Vicar of Banbury further Corrected ;*  
Wherein their SUBTILTIES,  
EVASIONS, and PRE-  
VARICATIONS, are Ob-  
viously Exposed.

---

By *Benjamin Loveling, M. A.*  
*Vicar of Banbury.*

---

L O N D O N :

Printed for *Geo. Thorp*, Bookseller in *Ban-*  
*bury*, and sold by *J. Nutt*, near *Sationers-*  
*Hall.* 1704.

Harvard College Library  
Peabody Fund  
June 6 1938

OF THE  
QUESTIONS  
OR AN  
ANSWER

To the Book  
WHICH  
THE  
QUESTIONS  
AND  
ANSWERS  
OF

BY  
THE  
REV. FATHER

AND  
THE  
REV. FATHER



---

---

THE  
PREFACE.

**T**Here having been  
Two Pamphlets  
lately Printed in  
Mr. Viver's Name; and  
I having Publish'd an An-  
swer to each, without look-  
ing on him as the Author;  
fearing that some who are  
not acquainted with his

## The Preface.

Talents, may suppose I injure him; (tho' by the way 'tis no manner of Credit to be the Author of such wretched Stuff) I shall beg my Reader's Patience while I Relate, and briefly Reflect upon a Passage for his own Satisfaction, as well as my Defence.

On Wednesday Morning, the Eighth of December last, I went to Mr. Vivers's House, and ask'd him if he was the Author of the Book, intituled, The  
Vicar



## The Preface.

Vicar of Banbury further Corrected; *He told me, He own'd the Book. When I desir'd him to be more plain; He Reply'd, The Book was his. So, (said I) are all the Books in my Study; But did you MAKE it? To which he Answered, I tell thee Friend, I will STAND BY IT. I told him, the Answer was not direct; for we are to stand by the Bible; but to say we made it, would be Blas-*  
A 3 phemy.

## The Preface.

phemy. *At that up starts a Friend, and saying more than once with an Air of Assurance, Neighbour Vivers did make the Book, encourag'd him to affirm positively, he did: Well then (said I,) you must needs understand what is in it; Pray what's the meaning of Opus operatum, and The Rule of contraries? whereunto they reply'd; Dost thou come here to Catechize us? Are we to be Catechiz'd by thee?*

*Where,*



## The Preface.

Whereupon I desired to see the Original Manuscript; which he evaded, by alledging, that he was going out of Town: Tho' he tarried with me talking about other Matters, much longer than he might have been fetching it.

Now I would intreat the Impartial Reader to consider,

First, Whether Mr. Vivers's Shuffling and Dodging, and not readily asserting, that he made the

A 4 Book;



## The Preface.

*Book; His not being able to give an Account of what was in it; His refusing to shew me the Original Manuscript, and pretending want of Time, when he tarried much longer than he might have been shewing it; do not naturally infer, That the Pamphlet publish'd under his Name, and asserted by the Fraternity to be his, must necessarily have been composed by another hand.*

2. *Whether to tell and stand in so notorious an Untruth,*

## The Preface.

truth, be not such a base instance of Immorality in this Banbury-Speaker, as might justly exclude him from humane Society, and Conversation in this, as well as from Happiness in the other World, if he does not as publickly recant his Sin, as he has committed it.

3. Whether the cunning Heads of the distemper'd Body of the Quakers, knowing that Mr. V. is not the Author, and yet ordering

## The Preface.

ing the Book to be Publish'd  
in his Name; perswading  
the Simple Sort to believe  
them; and putting the pre-  
tended Author against his  
Conscience to own he made  
it, be not Partakers of his  
Sin, and true Children  
of the Father of Lyes.

4. Whether the several  
rank Prevarications, I  
have taken out of their Book,  
and in the following Sheets  
exhibited to the World, be  
not all of a Piece, with this  
Instance of their Sincerity,  
and

## The Preface.

and equally the Fruits of  
the same Spirit of Error  
and Deceit.

5. Whether I ought not  
in Conscience to detect their  
Fallacies and Impostures,  
as well to maintain my own  
Character, as to prevent the  
unwary from being carri-  
ed away with their Dis-  
simulation.

Lastly, Whether there  
be not a Moral Impossi-  
bility, the Leaders of 'em  
will ever be reclaim'd, whilst  
their Principles are so de-  
bauch'd



## The Preface.

*bauch'd, as to call Evil  
Good, and put Darkness  
for Light; and their Pra-  
ctices so truly Jesuitical,  
as to support a Wicked  
Cause, by such Wicked  
and Damnable Means.*

---

*THE*

THE  
PLAIN-DEALING, &c.

**I**T may be no Disservice to Christianity, to let the World see to what unjustifiable Shifts its Enemies are put, to maintain their Errors. I shall therefore, as briefly as possible, mention *some* of the *many* Prevarications, Evasions, and Turns of Sophistry, used by the Quakers, to discredit those Truths which I have advanc'd against 'em: whereby 'twill appear how little they regard Revelation, when their Practice is a direct Contradiction even to the *Light of Nature*.

The

The Instance in the *Preface*, is a notorious Piece of Shuffling and Prevarication; an unworthy Imposition upon Mankind, who have naturally a Right to Truth, whereof they cannot be defrauded, without the Sin of Injustice.

Pag. 1.

Another Prevarication may be seen in their *Epistle*, where they complain of our *Appearing in Print*, when they are not ignorant how much they avoided the Conference with Mr. *Bugg*, by advising him, in their first Letter, to contest the matter with 'em from the *Press*.

Ibid.

Their Appeal to the Judgment of the Lord Chief Justice *Hales*, on purpose to delude the World into a false Opinion, That he countenanced their ill Tenets, is a farther Token of their want of Sincerity; as well as a base Reflection on the Memory of that pious Man, who not only highly approv'd of those Christian Ordinances which they openly contemn; but took care in all his Writings to shun their Profane  
and

and Heterodox Positions: and has expressly said, *Among all the differing Discourse Persuasions among us, there are none of Religion, p. 16.* that give a man more ample Evidence of MISTAKES, than those People called Quakers.

And that the Book and the Dedication might be both of a Piece, we find the same abominable vein of Sophistry therein. They speak in general of their owning the three that bear Record in Heaven; but never acknowledge a Trinity of Persons in the Unity of the Divine Substance, as the Article directs: Consequently they would impose upon the Governours, who expect they should hold the DOCTRINE OF THE BLESSED TRINITY AS IT IS DECLARED IN THE ARTICLES OF RELIGION. This I gave 'em to understand before; but, according to their wonted Sincerity, they were pleased to take no notice of it.

They say, *If I can bring any plain and exprest Scripture, which declares* Pag. 2. *with-*



*without any Figure, the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God, they'll acknowledge it. Now, tho' I have prov'd both the Testaments to be so, from the plain Expressions of Christ himself, yet they pass this material Point over, without any manner of Observation.*

*Quak. a  
Comp. p.  
18.*

*Pag. 24.*

*They affirm, I assert in my former Reply, Admitting some People do employ Mr. B. for the raising Persecution, it cannot therefore be said, that he is employed by any for ill Ends; when my Words entire are these: Admitting some People do employ Mr. B. for the raising Persecution, yet in the Judgment and Practices of the Quakers themselves, it cannot be said, &c. The Quakers are very loath to take notice, that in their own Judgment and Practices Persecution is allowable; and therefore chuse rather to misrepresent me, than to mention what they think will tend to their Disadvantage. This Fallacy they obtruded upon the World before, and now very modest-*

*Quak. a  
Comp. p.  
91.*

modestly renew it, notwithstanding I had a *second time*, in Justification of my self, made the same due distinction.

They assert, *The Holy Spirit will* Pag. 4.  
*never dictate what will overturn or contradict the Holy Scriptures.* Whereby they would insinuate, That I had advanc'd the contrary; which is downright Injustice. I never so much as thought the Holy Spirit either would or could prejudice the Holy Scriptures, which were all given by his Inspiration: but only prov'd, That their arrogant Pretences to the extraordinary Motions of the Spirit, and giving 'em the Preference to the standing Rule of our Faith and Manners, would tend to the overturning the Holy Scriptures. And this (alas!) sad Observation does but too plainly testify.

*See the Vicar of Banbury corrected, p. 4.*

They are displeased at my saying, *Their making a large Confession* Pag. 4.  
*of their Faith in Christ*, in the Person of Mr. V. and his Friends, *is nothing to the purpose.* I say again,

B

'Tis

'Tis nothing to the purpose, whilst they stand to the quite different Testimony of their ancient Friends. Let 'em publicly burn those blasphemous Books which their Founders have written in derogation of our Saviour's Divinity and Incarnation; and then I'll accept of any wholesome Confession of Faith that shall be drawn up in the Name of Mr. V. and his Friends. Till they have done this, the World will conclude, as well as I, they only prevaricate.

Pag. 6.

And as they run from one thing into another, to shelter themselves from Conviction; so we find 'em striking in with the *Ana-Baptists*, and, to curry favour, pleading their Cause. They call our Baptism *Rantism*, because we use *Sprinkling*; and disallow *Infant Baptism*, because in the Institution, *Teaching goes before Baptizing*.

I might as justly tell 'em again,  
All this is nothing to their purpose,  
unless they would declare them-  
selves

selves *Ana-Baptists*. If they are against the use of *Water* in that Ordinance, what is it to them whether Persons be *Dipped* or *Sprinkled*? or whether those to whom the Ordinance is administered, be *Infants* or *adult Persons*? But something they must say; and as long as they contradict Truth, no matter *How*, or after *What manner*, it be done. Let 'em but once allow of the Element of *Water*, and the Method of applying it in the *Church of England* shall not want Vindication.

However, I have a word or two to say to my *Anonymous Correctors*, concerning *Sprinkling of Infants*; that so their scarcity either of *Knowledge* or *Sincerity* may appear to the Judicious part of Mankind.

They are to consider then, That the Word *Baptism* signifies \* *Wash-* \* Έδν μὴ βαπτισ-  
ing. Now, may not a Person or τας, except they wash.  
Thing be *washed* by *Sprinkling* as well as *Immersion*? And since *Bap-* Mark 7. 4.  
tism denotes washing with *Water* Διὰ τοῦ ὕδατος  
Baptis-

μὴτε, divers Washings. Heb. 9. 10.



indifferently, whether by *Dipping* or *Sprinkling*, when Christ instituted the Ordinance of Baptism, why should not our Governours, in this Climate especially, leave it to the Discretion of the Minister either to *dip*, or to *sprinkle*; both being consistent with the general Term of *Baptizing* or *Washing* 'em; and consequently, with the Institution of our blessed Lord?

And because the Method of administering Water in Baptism, is thus left to the Minister's Discretion; I hereby promise the *Quakers*, That if they will duly prepare themselves for the Ordinance, and accept of it, they shall all be *dip'd*. But if they will not, 'tis evident to all the World, that their passionate and ludicrous arguing against *Sprinkling*, is but a guilty Subterfuge.

Then for sprinkling *Infants*, they apparently follow a *wrong Scent* when they ridicule the Use of it. They say, in the Institution, *Teaching* goes before *Baptizing*: I say, no. Teach

Teach all Nations, Baptizing 'em, is no more than Baptizing, Teach 'em. Nor is it any good Objection, to alledge, Infants are not capable of being Taught, when the Original μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς, signifies *Disciple, or make Profelytes of all Nations, Baptizing 'em.* And that Infants are capable of being made Profelytes, by Initiation into the Church, is evident from God's *ancient Acceptance* of 'em before the Law, by the Ordinance of Circumcision; as well as from the suitable Practice of the Apostles, *Acts 16.* who Baptiz'd, and so made Profelytes of *whole Households.* *15. 1 Corinth. 1. 16.*

And fearing the *Ana-Baptists* should be too feeble to support their sinking Cause, they blend it very sily, with the groundless Objection of other Dissenters against the Use of the Cross. *The Vicar* (say *Pag. 8.* they) *neither hath nor can produce one Instance so plain, to prove it was any of the Apostle's Practice to sprinkle Infants in the face with Water,*

and to sign 'em with the sign of the Cross, and to call it the Baptism of Christ. And did the Vicar ever go about to prove, The Sign of the Cross was any part of Christs Baptism? Did not he expressly say, That the Sacrament of Baptism is intire without it? Did not he instance in the case of Private Baptism, which he esteems compleat, notwithstanding the Omission of the Sign of the Cross? Come, HONEST QUAKERS, What say you for your selves? Are ye Guilty of Prevarication, or Not Guilty? Ye had much better Confess the Fact: for if ye be tried by God, and the Country, I am sure ye will not have a good Deliverance.

Quak. a  
Comp.  
p. 42.

Page 7:

They say, The Vicar doth not only disagree with us, but with those of his own Church. How so? The Catechism of the Church of England shews and declares Water, not the Spirit, to be the outward and visible Sign, or Form in Baptism. What then? Where does the Vicar contradict this?

this? And if he does not, where is the *Quakers* Honesty? This is just such another Lye as they raised on *Godwin*, affirming that in his *Moses* and *Aaron* he calls the Lord's Supper a *Jewish Rite*; when I made it appear to 'em, that he said the quite contrary. And yet these Falsties and Slanders are blasphemously father'd upon the Spirit of Truth!

See Quak.  
a Comp.  
p. 60.

The *Quakers* tax me with adding to the *Scripture*, when I only joyn something to it by way of Inference from the *Context*: whereas they themselves make what Additions their Fancy suggests, be they never so contrary to *Sense*, *Reason*, or the *Analogy* of *Scripture*. Thus they repeat what I said by way of *Comment* upon St. *Paul's* Expression to the *Corinthians*: Christ sent me not to Baptize PRINCIPALLY, but to Preach the Gospel. And then, to make me as ridiculous as they can, they say, *Here the Vicar adds to the Text that which is not there*, (viz.) PRINCIPALLY.

Page. 16.



And do not they add to the Text that which is not there, and thereby pervert the Meaning of it, when they assert over and over, *He was not sent to Baptize* (viz.) **WITH WATER?** Are not the Words [with Water] as much an Addition to the Text, as the Word [principally]? With what Forehead then can they charge that on me as a Crime, which they themselves are, *to their own knowledge*, so notoriously guilty of?

Pag. 16.

They affirm, *That the Vicar seem'd to grant by an extraordinary way, we may be join'd to that Body whereof Christ is Head. The Vicar now saith the quite contrary is his fix'd Opinion, &c.* Now what else can these Men design by this, but to make me *little*, by representing me inconsistent with my self. But common Justice obliges me to detect this their *malicious* Untruth. My Character of 'em in *The Spirit of Quakerism* Rebuk'd, is this: 'They ought not to be numbred among  
' the

Pag. 21.

' the Family or Household of Faith.  
 ' The Name of a Christian does not  
 ' belong to them. And in *Quaker-*  
*ism a Complication, &c.* I assert, Pag. 74.  
 ' He who contemns this Ordinance  
 ' (of Baptism) as he is no Church-  
 ' Member, so neither can he be joyn'd  
 ' any way to that Body whereof  
 ' Christ is Head. Come, *Friends*, re-  
 solve me where the difference lies be-  
 tween what I have laid down in both  
 Books. And if there be none, ac-  
 knowledge fairly the true cause of  
 your endeavouring to perswade the  
 World that there is. But if you  
 conceal it, the more discerning part  
 of Mankind will make shift to see  
 through your *Cobweb-Arts*. And  
 that is my Satisfaction.

Another of their prevarications  
 lies in this *impertinent* Challenge: Pag. 9.  
*Now let the Vicar prove, That the*  
*Thief on the Cross was Baptiz'd with*  
*Water, unto whom Christ said, This*  
*day shalt thou be with me in Para-*  
*dise.* Here they would insinuate,  
 and a little before they expressly as-  
 sert,

Ephes. 5.  
23.

sert, That *all by me are damn'd that are not so baptiz'd*; which Opinion, as I never was *absolutely* of, so the *Quakers* know very well they cannot prove I ever maintain'd. But this I will stand by, that they cannot be sav'd in the *ordinary* way, because they are not visible Members of the *Church*, of which Body Christ is the Saviour. And as for such as wilfully reject the Ordinance, when due means of Conviction have been tendered them, Christ himself has plainly enough determin'd their Fate:

Mark 16.  
16.

*He that believeth, and is Baptiz'd, shall be saved; and he that believeth not shall be DAMN'D.* How then can these Men so often tax me with *Uncharitableness*, when I only say what the great Judge of the *Quick and Dead*, has so positively asserted?

Now this consider'd; To what purpose is their instance of the *Thief on the Cross*? What if he was not baptiz'd with Water? What if he was nevertheless to be with Christ in Paradise? Can the *Quakers* prove, that when he was nail'd

to

to the Croſs, and juſt expiring with a diſaffected croud about him, he had an *Opportunity* of being Baptized with Water? Or can they ſhew that he had often heard of Chriſt before, and rejected this ordinance? or that he went out of the World contemning and beſpattering it? If they cannot, I do not underſtand how the inſtance of this Thief can any way ſuit with them, unleſs in this particular, that before his Conversion he was a *Thief*, as they by their *Principles* are now *Robbers of the Church*.

They would ſlily inſinuate, That 'tis my Opinion, That *Outward Water can of it ſelf Waſh, Change, or Regenerate the Hearts of People*. Now herein likewise they do me manifeſt Injury; I having never aſſerted any thing like it. Nor can it be concluded becauſe I ſay our Saviour has made it an outward means of conveying the Spirit, that I am therefore perſwaded, our Souls are regenerate by the immediate Operation of Water; It being the *Holy Ghoſt* imparted to us  
by



by the Religious and Regular Application of Water, that Washes, Changes, or Regenerates the Hearts of People; and not Water separated from that *Principle* and *pure Fountain* of Grace.

- Pag. 13. My *Sincere Correctors* are pleased to say, *Neither the Quakers, nor Peter, but the Vicar is to be charg'd with*
- Pag. 12. *Impertinency*; And yet just before to support their own Heterodox denial of the Sacrament of Baptism, they in effect very evidently charge St. Peter with an *Impertinent Action*. In the 10th of the *Acts*, that Apostle perceiving the Holy Ghost was fallen upon the *Gentiles*, commanded *them to be baptized (with Water,) in the Name of the Lord*. But say the *Quakers, being Baptiz'd with the Holy Ghost, there was no need of Water*. No need of Water; where then was the pertinency of St. Peter's Command? Did he command without occasion? If he did not, how unworthily have these Men aspersed his Authority and Conduct, in saying, *the Holy Ghost*
- ver. 48.

*Ghost fell on the Gentiles as on the Apo-* Pag. 12.  
*stles at the beginning, and they being*  
*baptized therewith, there was no need of*  
*Water !*

Will they alledge, 'tis only said, he commanded them to be Baptized in the Name of the Lord, but no mention made of *Water* ? But they are to be inform'd, That the Element of *Water* being express'd in the *Vers*e before, to have inserted ver: 47. it again, would have been very superfluous. Besides, if his *Command* to baptize them, had not included the use of *Water*, what Reason had he to say, *Can any Man forbid Water, that these should not be Baptiz'd, &c.* why should he speak of that Element at all, if Baptism could have been administered by him without it ? Why should the *Eunuch* upon the like occasion say to *Philip*, *See, here is Water, what doth hinder me to be Baptiz'd ?* And why should both *Philip*, and the *Eunuch* go down into the *WATER*, for the Administration of this Ordinance ?

Act. 8. 36.  
38.

But

But farther, when St. *Peter* commanded those *Gentiles* to be baptized in the Name of the Lord : The Precept must be understood to relate either to the inward or the outward Baptism. That it cannot refer to the *Inward* is evident, because St. *Peter* very well knew they were already baptiz'd in that *Sense*, having received the *Holy Ghost*, as well as he, and the rest of the Apostles. And if it refer'd to the *outward* Baptism, or Baptism with *Water*, the *Quakers* must own themselves oblig'd to receive *Water-Baptism*, notwithstanding all their arrogant pretences to the Baptism of the *Holy Ghost*.

Now, as 'tis evident those *Gentiles* were by St. *Peter*'s special command baptized with *Water*, so is it no less certain that he gave that command ; because *Water-baptism* was to his certain knowledge *Instituted by our Lord* : otherwise, when the Jewish Converts murmur'd at his Acceptance of 'em, he would not have defended himself by alledging the

*Autho-*

*Authority of Christ* for what he had done. And 'tis but rank Equivocation in the *Quakers* to object, (as some of the chief of 'em have done in my hearing) *That Peter brought our Saviour's Authority only to justify his Familiarity with the Gentiles*, when the case is so very clear, that his Familiarity towards 'em, which the Jewish Converts were offended at, consisted chiefly in his admitting 'em into the Christian Church by the Ordinance of *Outward Baptism*. So that the Authority of our Saviour quoted by *St. Peter*, countenances as well the Use of Baptism with *Water*, as it does the Administration thereof to *Gentile* as well as *Jewish* Believers. And therefore neither *St. Peter*, nor the *Vicar*, but the *Quakers*, are to be charged with unsufferable Impertinency. AAs 1.16.

My Plain-dealing Correctors make me this Proposal in the Person of *Mr. Vivers*; If he will, or can prove, Pag. 12.  
by plain Scripture, that the Apostles were so Baptiz'd or Sprinkl'd, and by whom,



Act 9.

whom, he will contribute something to my Satisfaction, That Water was intended by Christ, in Matt. 28. 19, &c. Well, if they have any Spark of Integrity in 'em, I question not but to convert 'em. 'Tis plain from Scripture, that St. Paul was baptiz'd by Ananias, by Christ's own Order. This Baptism could not be inward Baptism; for the case is clear, St. Paul was Converted by our Saviour's Appearance and Address to him, before ever Ananias was acquainted with the matter. For the Lord tells Ananias in a Vision, before he had baptiz'd him, that he was a *chosen Vessel*, and that he was at that instant *praying in the house of Judas*: And 'tis certain he had then given over his Journey to *Damascus* for the Persecution of the Christian Church, and was extreamly willing to do whatever our Saviour should be pleased to order. So that the Symptoms of Conversion being visible in him, no doubt but he had been baptiz'd with the *Holy Ghost*, to dispose

dispose him so readily for embracing the Gospel, and renouncing Judaism, to which he had all along been so conscientiously stedfast. And that in those times the Holy Ghost was often given *before* the Administration of Water-Baptism, may truly be concluded from the above-mention'd case of the Gentile Converts, baptized by St. Peter with *Water*, *after* they had received the Holy Ghost. And therefore, the Baptism which *Ananias* had administred to St. Paul, was certainly *outward*; consequently Water-baptism was by Christ's own appointment required; Tho' Baptism with the Holy Ghost had been given him already.

Nor is it to be question'd, but the rest of the Apostles were born, as well as St. Paul, not only *with the Spirit*, but *with Water* too, in order to their *Entrance into the kingdom of God*.

Again, they say, *The Vicar should prove, that the outward Elements he* Pag. 15.  
*contends for the use of, were as plainly commanded to be used as Circumcision*

*was.* This is another sly Insinuation on purpose to cheat the Reader into a belief, that I had not prov'd it. But, *Plain-dealing Friends!* were not the Elements of Bread and Wine as Intelligibly mention'd in the New Testament, as all the materials of the *Passover* in the Old? And since Baptism and washing with Water are as Synonymous Terms, as Circumcision and cutting of the Fore-skin can possibly be, does not the command, *Go, Baptize all Nations,* as much oblige Christians to the use of Water-baptism; as, *Let every Male-Child among you be Circumcised,* oblig'd the *Jews* to the punctual use of cutting off the Fore-skin? Oh! That I had Men of *Conscience* to deal with? what Satisfaction should I feel in their speedy Conversion!

Pag. 16.

*Must it follow, (say they) That whatever the Apostles did they were sent to do, and had a Command from Christ to do? For the Apostle Paul was not sent of God to Circumcise, tho' he did Circumcise Timothy; nor to Baptize with*  
*Water,*

*Water, tho' he did Baptize a few at Corinth.* Here we have a Complication of *Prevaricating Turns*. Who ever said *St. Paul* had a Command from Christ to do every thing he did? And if he had not a Command to Circumcise, does it therefore follow, he had no Command to baptize? They say themselves, *he had the same* *Ibid.* *Commission as Peter*, and was not *Peter* commanded to baptize? How came he to baptize the *Gentiles*, if he had not Authority to do it? Was not Christ's Authority sufficient? And did not he stop the Mouths of the Jewish Converts, (as above mentioned) by pleading the Command of Christ, for what he then did? Now if, as they say, *Paul* had the same Commission as *Peter*, he had certainly (according to them) a Command from Christ to baptize with Water, as well as *St. Peter*, included in his Apostolical Character. And therefore, when he tells the *Faithious Corinthians*, *He was not sent to baptize*, it must be understood, (as



said before) he was not sent **PRINCIPALLY**. For he expresses the Reason why he *thanked God he had Baptiz'd* no more in that contentious Place, (namely) *Left any one should say, I had Baptiz'd in my own Name*. Plainly alluding to the peculiar Indisposition of that unhappy Church at that juncture : Not but that the Ordinance of Baptism was still continued there, only 'twas advisedly administred by Men of *less Note*, that they might not thereby be broken into Parties, and say, *I am of Paul, and I of Apollo, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ*. Now, tho' I had in effect given the *Quakers* this Account in my *Last*, yet according to their *usual Honesty*, they *Ingeniously* overlook'd it.

As to the use of the Cross *after* Baptism, I have already given my Judgment of the matter ; and it lying not within the Compass of our Controversie with the *Quakers*, I designedly drop it ; assuring 'em that if they have a mind to become

Chri-

1 Cor. 1.  
15.

ver. 12.

Quack. 4  
Comp.  
Pag. 72.

Quack. 4  
Comp.  
Pag. 42.

Christians by a regular Baptism, they shall not want satisfaction in this, or any other point, that is now contested between us and other Dissenters. Nor shall I enter upon a Justification of the *Ceremonies* in general of the *English Church*, which they endeavour to decry, till they give up those more *Substantial* matters that are unhappily in debate between them and us. Pag. 25.

They pass by the Sacrament of the *Lord's Supper*, without giving any manner of Reason, why it should be discontinued, notwithstanding the many Arguments I produced in behalf of the use of it: which shews their horrid Prevarication, and that their Consciences begin to *correct* 'em for their contempt of that *Honourable, Compassionate, and Advantagious* Ordinance. 'Tis true, They say, *Might not what he* Pag. 19.  
(the Vicar) *calls the two Sacraments, be used or continued for a time, for the like Reason that Circumcision was?*  
But not a word of answer to the

*Practice of the Catholick Church, which I urg'd in behalf of the perpetual continuance of the Sacraments. To invalidate which Argument, they ought to have shewn, in what Centuries and Parts of Christendom they were generally rejected. Nor do they meddle with what I cited out of St. Paul: As oft as ye eat this Bread, or drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death till he come. Or with G. Whitehead's peculiar but impious notion of Christ's coming to Judgment. No, have a care of that; That would have unluckily destroyed what they intended to establish.*

Quak. a  
Comp.  
Pag. 50.  
51.

Pag. 1:2

They confidently assert, That *the Government esteems them Christians; and that the Vicar* terming them *Ignorant Heathens, &c.* does therefore *contradict the Queen and Government, &c.* which (say they) *is great Presumption in a Vicar of a Country-Town.* But what if I should make it appear, that according to this Plea of theirs, I treat the Government

h

*honourably*; and they are the Persons that egregiously *vilifie* it?

They must understand then, The Queen and both Houses of Parliament have over and over declared their *firm Adherence* to the Church of *England*. Now in one of her *Articles* 'tis exprest, That *Art. 27.*  
*Baptism is a sign of Regeneration, or new Birth, whereby, as by an Instrument, they who receive Baptism rightly, are GRAFTED INTO THE CHURCH, &c.* And that the *Baptism of YOUNG CHILDREN is in any wise to be retain'd in the Church, as most agreeable with the Institution of Christ.* So that from the *Article* we may learn, not only that *Infants* are capable of being Baptized, but that there is no way of grafting Men into the Church, or making 'em *Church-Members*, but by the regular Administration of Baptism with *Water*.

But now, will they say, The Queen, and both Houses of Parliament, who profess themselves of the



*English Church*, do not hold this *Article*, which is one of the *Doctrines* of the *Church of England*? Then they treat the *Governours* dishonourably, by affirming in effect, That they do not inwardly believe what they openly consent to. Or will they say our *Governours* do approve of this *Article* in its true Signification? Then the *Queen* and *Parliament* cannot look on 'em as *Christians*, they being not as the *Article* directs, *grafted by Baptism into the Church of Christ*. And then their villifying *Infant* and *Water Baptism* at that extravagant rate, can be no due Instance of *Duty* and good *Manners* to their *Superiours*, who, to their own *Knowledge*, are convinc'd of the *Lawfulness* and *Necessity* of Both.

My *Shuffling Correctors* discover a very pleasant *Uneasiness* at my proving 'em *bad Subjects* by their *Principles*; and, with all the crooked *Windings* of the *Serpent*, would evade my *Arguments*.

When

When I shew how their Pretences to *immediate Inspiration* may be a means to overturn Government, they have no other way to come off, but to tell us, We of the Church of *England* pretend to the *like*: Whereas they cannot but know Pag. 18  
 That the *English* Church is far from teaching Men to expect the *extraordinary* Gifts of God's Spirit: And that G. Fox says of the *Quakers*, *They are in the same Power, Under-<sup>Great</sup>standing, and IMMEDIATE REVE-<sup>Myst.</sup>LATION from Heaven, that the Apo-<sup>P. 242.</sup>stles were in.*

When I speak against their Principle of refusing to *Swear*, when required by the Magistrate, for the Administration of Justice, and putting an end to Strife; They *wrest* my Meaning, applying the whole matter to *common Swearing*: tho' Pag. 13.  
 they have no Reason to suppose, but I do as justly and zealously abhor that provoking 'em, as any *Quaker* possibly can.

When

Ibid.

Quak. a  
Comp.  
p. 84.

When I conclude 'em ill Subjects from their denying to *take up Arms* for the Safety of their Prince and Nation, they unfairly inveigh against *Private Quarrels*, about which we have no Dispute. Now 'tis an unworthy thing in my *dodging Correctors* to run thus from the Point: and if they say they do not, they must, by their *own Confession*, be treacherous Subjects; since, as I told 'em, 'Tis possible a Nation may 'be so reduced, as to need the personal Assistance of all its able Inhabitants.' And if every Subject was besotted with this their *pernicious* Principle, the unhappy Society to which they belong, must unavoidably be the Booty of any ambitious Oppressor.

Pag. 20.

With what Confidence can my *Prevaricating Correctors* affirm, They have a due regard to those that are in Authority, and are mindful to obey Magistrates, and to be ready to every good Work; when no longer ago than the Last Fast, and at many other times, when

when the Civil Magistrate solemnly enjoyns Abstinence from all secular Employments, they will not stick to *open their Shops*? Why should they be against *Pulling off* <sup>Ibid.</sup> *the Hat* to Princes, and yet require their Apprentices to stand bare behind the Counter? This their Practice evidently infers, That they look upon such Observances as Symptoms of Respect; why then should they deny this branch of Honour to those Persons, from whom they are placed by Providence at a much greater distance than their Apprentices are from *them*? And why will they say, *They do not esteem that true Honour or* <sup>Ibid.</sup> *Respect stands in those things*? What! Have not the *Quakers* been long enough in *England* to know that such Things are among *Englishmen* the common Instances of Respect? The *Dialect* in Scripture to the *Jewish* and other Princes, was, according to the Custom of those *Eastern Nations*, no less expressive of



of due Deference, than our way of Address can be: But their way by no means comports with the usual Compellations of *English* Subjects. And my *Lurking* Correctors may as reasonably send for Workmen and turn all their *Tables* into *Beds*, and eat their Meals *lying in one another's Bosom*, as so strictly contend for saying *Thou* and *Thee*. But *why does the Vicar use it in saying his Prayers, if it tends to take away that wise distinction between Superiors and Inferiors?* I tell you why; Because 'tis as much the innocent Custom among *us* to say *Thee* or *Thou* when we are supplicating God, as to say *You* to one another. And my *Trifling* Correctors cannot but be sensible, That when we are Praying, we use awful Expressions, and ascribe to the Deity such glorious Characters, and withal address him in such submissive Gestures, and with uncovered Heads, that teach us sufficiently to *know our distance*.

When

When I speak against their *Political Meetings*, their assembling themselves together out of all Parts, with their Doors shut, contrary to the *Act of Toleration*, to carry on with greater Secrecy their wretched Cause, and keep the *well-meaning* People of their own Tribe in the dark. My *Correctors* are so very candid as to talk of their *Religious Meetings*, where all their Gang are *promiscuously* received. Whereas, I plainly proved it from their Apostle Fox's own Words, that such Political Meetings were *Treasonable*. But this they either could not, or *would not* see: And the Reader may judge which to impute it to. Ibid.

They venture to assert, That the *Vicar* neither has, nor can prove 'em *Hereticks and Blasphemers*: When their Conscience must tell 'em, That out of their own Books he prov'd 'em *Both*; and that they have said nothing like an Argument against it. And since they challenge the *Vicar's Second*, Edward See Quak. a Comp. p. 89.

Pag. 20.

Pag. 23.

Cock-

Cockson Rector of Westcoat Barton, to prove any Doctrine they hold, by plain and expresse Scripture, to be damnable Heresie; I would beseech 'em to read over his late Book entitled, *The Quakers no Protestant Dissenters*; where every Article of the Christian Faith is set out in its True Light, their several Tenets examin'd thereby, and plainly prov'd to disagree therewith, and consequently to be *Heretical*.

There are yet several Prevarications, and subtle Evasions, which I could very plainly charge 'em with, but they are such *trifling, silly* Things, that I shall not stoop to meddle with 'em; especially having already produced so many undeniable Instances of their Sophistry and Baseness, that may sufficiently convince Mankind *what Spirit they are of*.

Only, I shall take notice how much they abuse and misrepresent my just Complaint of the *Licentiousness of the Press*; which pregnant  
Evil

Evil (blessed be God) the Honorable House of Commons is at this Juncture upon Curing.

When I mention some of the deplorable Disadvantages which Religion receives by such an unhappy Connivance; they quite pervert my Design, by saying, *I speak against Printing only that I might have Liberty to misrepresent them and their Principles, and that they might be prevented the like Liberty to Reply, and detect my Falshoods.* I gave, I think, Quak. a  
Comp. p.  
105. good Reasons why Printing should be restrain'd to its true Use; but am very sure, never mention'd what they are pleased to insinuate. Now I declare to all the World, were it not out of pure Regard to Religion and the Publick, I could desire, with all my heart, the Press might be left at the Liberty it now has: For, the oftner my Correctors write, the more Opportunities I shall have to dissect the Quakers, and make 'em so stink Above ground, that the sensible part of Mankind, looking on 'em



'em as the *Pest* of Society, will be induced to wish all the *Leaders* of 'em *Under*.

5. 27. They say, The Mischiefs Religion receives are not from *Printing*, but *Mens Carnality*. I deny not but their *Carnality* puts 'em upon *Broaching* and *Defending* their *Unchristian Tenets*; but then, they could not be so *Publickly pernicious*, had they not the *Liberty* of spreading 'em from the *Press*. And the *Quakers* could not but *know*, that *this* was my *Meaning*, tho' they unworthily *conceal* it.

*Quak. a*  
*Comp. p.*  
*106.* I said in my *Last*, 'We that are *Ministers of Christ*, have but too much reason to complain of the *Press*. Alas! our Province by such means is rendred difficult, and our Labours many times, to our great Grief, unsuccessful! How can we be so beneficial to our Flock from the *Pulpit*, when the *Press* swarms with such ungodly Positions, as quite contradict the Substance of our Sermons! Good God! Is not  
' this

‘this putting Religion to great,  
 ‘(and I am afraid UNJUSTIFI-  
 ‘ABLE) SHIFTS.

Now how do my *Correctors* an-  
 swer this? Even thus. *True and* Pag. 28.  
*undefiled Religion, and the Ministers*  
*that are truly Religious, CANNOT*  
 MAKE USE OF UNJUSTIFI-  
 BLE SHIFTS.

—*risum teneatis amici?*

I would now beseech the *Quakers*  
 duly to reflect upon these their Pro-  
 ceedings, and *without Prejudice* con-  
 sider, whether such abominable  
 Prevarications and Sophistical turns,  
 be not an impious abuse of Reason,  
 and the excellent and merciful facul-  
 ty of Speech : Whether such impo-  
 sitions upon Mankind be not all  
*Noted in God's Book*, who is the  
*Searcher of Hearts*. *God is not a Man*  
*that he should lie*, or suffer Lies to go  
 D un-

unpunish'd: Retract them then, inconsiderate Wretches! before ye be summon'd to answer for 'em. What! will you madly carry your Sophistry to the Grave! Do you think the Devil has not a greater measure of it than even your selves? And can he *Escape the Judgment of God?* Away then with these *little, idle, unworthy* Fallacies, which are seen through by *Men*, and sure must all *vanish as the Morning-Cloud*, when the *Sun of Righteousness* shall rise in his *Power and great Glory*. Despise mistaken Honour; break the *Golden Chain* of Interest, that has so long *linkt* you together; lay by the *Phantom* of your getting into Power; make way for *Conscience*; Renounce *Quakerism*, embrace the *Gospel* in its *full Extent* as well as *Orthodox Interpretation*. *Quench not the Spirit*: Ye have been but too long proving what is bad! 'tis now more than time for you to *hold fast that which is good*. Distinguish, I beseech

feech you, between your *Souls*  
and their *Saviour*; between the  
*Holy Ghost* and your *misguided Fan-*  
*cies* : And (in a word) over-cast  
Hell with a *melancholly Disappoint-*  
*ment*, by making *God*, and *Angels*,  
and all *Good-men*, joyful at your *Con-*  
*version*.

---

FINIS.